

## R E M A R K S

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claim 7 and 8 are objected to.

Claims 1-6 and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung et al. (U.S. 6,282,570) (hereinafter Leung).

In the response to argument section, page 14, of the Office Action it is asserted that “Secondly, Applicant argues that there is no teaching in Leung one monitoring device is updated based on registered data.”

The Office Action argues in the next paragraph that if a table increases (updated) beyond a certain number of rows, the user can be alerted.

However it is respectfully submitted that applicant does not see how this is equivalent to applicant's claimed two databases, for example, wherein when the second monitoring device receives the registered data altered by the updating operation from the first monitoring device, the second monitoring device updates registered data recorded in the database accommodated by the second monitoring device based on the registered data received from the first monitoring device.

Leung discloses a monitoring device 308 which monitors multiple databases. But there is no description of a second monitoring device updating data in a database accommodated by the second monitoring device. In fact each of the sections referenced in the Office Action (col. 7, 8 and 12) only describe the monitoring device collecting data from multiple databases. No description was found which corresponds to applicant's claimed invention of the second monitoring device. For example Leung does not disclose two of the database monitor 308, and

each database monitor 308 communicates with the other so as to update each database stored therein.

In the Office Action, it's argued that the third step and the fourth step as recited in the present claim 1 are disclosed in Leung. However, if "the database monitor 308" of Leung is argued to correspond to "the monitoring device" of the present claimed invention, it is unclear to applicant where the second monitor, which updates a database accommodated by the second monitoring device based on data received from the first monitoring device, is described in Leung.

The only description found in Leung is that a monitor monitors a collection of databases and that users define what the database monitor does. For example "If the table increases beyond a certain number of rows, the user may want the database monitor [206] to prune the table. In both cases, the user defines what the database monitor [206] does." (col. 4:22-25). This is completely different from applicant's claimed two database monitors.

A clarification as to which constituent elements of Leung correspond to "the second monitoring device" and "the communication device" recited in the third step of Claim 1, respectively is requested.

With regard to claims 9-11, 16 and 17 of this application at least the above point apply and the same requests are made.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the remarks set forth above.

However, if the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance and a discussion would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian S. Myers  
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone: (212) 940-8703

Fax: (212) 940-8986/8987

Docket No.: FUJY 19.017 (100794-11750)

BSM:rm